

<b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/586,690	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SUGA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> DEVANG PATEL	<b>Art Unit</b> 1793	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) DEVANG PATEL.

(2) Mark Guttag.

**Date of Interview:** 31 March 2010

**Type of Interview:**  
☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes    ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**  
 Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:  
 2, 3, 50

Prior art documents discussed:

**Status of Application:** Being allowed

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time:** 9:30 am

**Part II.**  
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**  
*Examiner and Applicant discussed refining the claim language concerning "adhering substance layer" and "bonding interface" in order to accurately reflect the crushing step unique to the invention and distinguish the claims from prior art. With respect to claim 50, it was agreed to recite bonding portions formed of gold replacing the hardness limitation. Specifically, the amended limitations in claims 2, 3 and 50 are described in Examiner's amendment attached herein.*

**Part III.**  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Devang Patel/  
 Examiner, Art Unit 1793

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)